APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/805,376	03/14/2001	Jake Hill	36-1578	1537

23117	7590	02/23/2005

NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC
1100 N GLEBE ROAD
8TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22201-4714

EXAMINER
CHUONG, TRUC T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/805,376	HILL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Truc T Chuong	2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>16 December 2004</u>.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This communication is responsive to an Amendment, filed 12/16/04.

2.   Claims 1-24 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 8-9, 12-13, 19-20, 23 and 24 are

independent claims. In the Amendment, claims 13-18 are amended, and claim 24 is a new claim.

This action is made non-final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4.   Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pensak et al.

(U.S. Patent No. 6,289,450 B1).

As to claim 1, Pensak teaches a computer/network interface device comprising:

a first interface for receiving data from a first zone in a first zone data format (Authoring

user computer, e.g., col. 5 lines 50-65, col. 6 lines 15-30, and fig. 2);

means for processing said received data through performance of a cryptographic

operation on at least a portion thereof (encrypting documents, e.g., col. 2 lines 10-20, and col. 6

lines 15-30);

a second interface for sending said processed data to a second zone in a second zone data

format (sending documents and hash to the server, e.g., col. 7 lines 46-51, and col. 6 lines 35-

50); and

means arranged to pass said processed data exclusively from said processing means to

said second interface (the Administrator Utility Server will send the encrypted documents to the

viewer, e.g., col. 7 line 57-col. 8 line 45, and fig. 2)..

As to claim 2, Pensak teaches a computer/network interface device as claimed in claim 1

further comprising:

means arranged to convert said received data in said first zone data format into at least

one data format other than said first zone data format prior to said data processing (The

Application Interface 230 must also be loaded before the document or information can be

encrypted, e.g., col. 6 line 63-15).

As to claim 3, Pensak teaches a computer/network interface device as claimed in claim 1

further comprising:

means arranged to transform the data format of said received data from said first zone at

least twice prior to said data processing (the document can be encrypted in many times based on

only selected viewing users under selected circumstances, e.g., col. 2 lines 10-43).

As to claim 4, Pensak teaches a computer/network interface device as claimed in claim 1

in which said first zone data format is packetized data, further comprising:

means for reading at least one item of identification data from each packet (segment IDs,

e.g., col. 7 lines 16-45);

wherein said processing means is arranged to process each respective packet in dependence on each corresponding item of identification data (e.g., col. 2 lines 10-43, and col. 7 lines 16-45).

As to claim 5, Pensak teaches a computer/network interface device as claimed in claim 4 further comprising:

a store for storing one or more rules, each rule being linked with at least one of item of identification data (IDs for encryption, e.g., col. 7 lines 16-45); wherein

said processing means is arranged to process each packet in dependence upon the rule linked with the corresponding item(s) of identification data (verify the user permission/profile/id for viewing/decrypting, e.g., col. 7 line 59-col. 8 line 60).

As to claim 6, Pensak teaches a computer/network interface device as claimed in claim 1 wherein one of the first and second interfaces is suitable for connection to a host such that the data format utilized by such a connected interface is one utilized by the host (fig. 2).

As to claim 7, Pensak teaches a computer/network interface device as claimed in claim 5 wherein one of the first and second interfaces is suitable for connection to a host such that the data format utilized by such a connected interface is one utilized by the host in which, in response to receiving at least one control packet including at least an item of control identification data and control instructions through the interface not connected to the host and reading said item of control identification data from a control packet, said processing means is arranged to change said rules in said store in dependence upon said corresponding control instructions (e.g., col. 1 lines 29-45, col. 7 line 59-col. 8 line 60, and fig. 2).

As to claim 8, Pensak teaches a computer/network interface device comprising:

A first interface for receiving data from a first authorized party in a first data format;

means for processing said received said received data through performance of a computational operation on at least a portion thereof (e.g., col. 5 lines 50-65, col. 6 lines 15-30, and fig. 2);

a second interface for sending said processed data to a second authorized party in a second data format (sending documents and hash to the server, e.g., col. 7 lines 46-51, and col. 6 lines 35-50);

means arranged to pass said processed data exclusively from said processing means to said second interface (the Administrator Utility Server will send the encrypted documents to the viewer, e.g., col. 7 line 57-col. 8 line 45, and fig. 2);

wherein said operation performed by said processing means is such that if said sent processed data is intercepted by an unauthorized party, the recovery of said received data from said processed data is computational unfeasible (only the registered/identified viewer can view/decrypt the encrypted documents, e.g., col. 7 line 57-col. 8 line 60).

As to claims 9-11, they are method claims of system claims 1-3. Note the rejection of claims 1-3 above respectively.

As to claim 12, this is a method of system claim 8. Note the rejection of claim 8 above.

As to claims 13 and 24, Pensak teaches a host/network interface apparatus comprising:

a first port for communication with said host using an internal data format used internally by said host (e.g., col. 5 lines 50-65, col. 6 lines 15-30, and fig. 2);

a second port for communication with said network using a network data format (encrypted communication link is established between the authoring user's computer 222 and the

server 206, the authoring user's computer 222 provides login and authentication information to

the server 206, 1050. The server 206 authenticates the authoring user's 208 identity and verifies

that the authoring user 208 has authority to use the system by checking a database of registered

users 236 maintained on the server, e.g., col. 6 lines 15-30);

means for processing data received from at least one of said ports through performance of

a cryptographic operation on at least a portion of said received data (encrypting documents, e.g.,

col. 2 lines 10-20, and col. 6 lines 15-30); and

means arranged to pass said processed data exclusively from said means for processing to

the other of said ports (the Administrator Utility Server will send the encrypted documents to the

viewer, e.g., col. 7 line 57-col. 8 line 45, and fig.2).

As to claim 14-18, they are similar in scopes to claims 2-5, and 7 above; therefore,

rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 19, it can be rejected under similar rationale as claim 8 above.

As to claims 20-23, they are method claims of system claims 12, 14, 15, and 19. Note the

rejections of claims 12, 14, 15, and 19 above respectively.

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view

of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

Brandenburg (U.S. Patent No. 5,894,516) teaches encrypting/decrypting

documents, user profiles, id, and the host computer to control the operations (cols. 1-5,

and fig. 1).

Pebley et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,154,840) teach first/second user to send

encrypting data with the key (id) to decrypt the data (cols. 2-6 and figs. 1-2).

Pavlik (U.S. Patent No. 6,807633 B1) teaches encryption/decryption documents

(cols. 3-9 and figs. 1-3).

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Truc T Chuong whose telephone number is 571-272-4134. The

examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and alternate Fridays 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Truc T. Chuong

02/21/05

BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER